REMARKS

Applicant has amended Claims 4 and 10 to remove the awkward language.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 17 and 20 because the process of adjusting the intensity of the illumination is not described. Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to Paragraph 23 where the process is described specifically.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11-15, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Durr, US 5,452,632. Before specifically considering Durr, it may be helpful to briefly review Claims 1. In accordance with the invention, at least one adjustable drive of a cutter associated with an image printer is calibrated by the following steps:

setting the adjustable drive of the cutter to a first setting;

printing a calibration print with the image printer;

moving the calibration print with the adjustable drive of the cutter;

comparing a chosen feature of the calibration print to the distance that the print is moved by the adjustable drive and deriving an input signal representative of the difference between the chosen feature and the distance that the calibration print is moved by the adjustable drive; and

correcting the adjustable drive in response to the input signal.

This method, while requiring that a calibration print be moved through the cutter, has the advantage that it is simpler than an active system in which errors are detected and corrected for on the fly. Once the adjustable drive has been calibrated by the method of the invention, subsequent prints can be positioned without active control over the adjustable drive.

In Durr, in distinction to applicant's method, control is continuous, a differential error signal is created each time a printed image moves to the cutter, and an actual value

corresponding to the difference between the rotational angle γ_1, of the rubber-blanket cylinders 3 and 4 and of the rotational angle γ_2 of the cutting cylinder 11 are fed as an actual value to the cutter drive controller 16. Depending upon the deviation from a selected setpoint value $\Delta\Upsilon_{SETPOINT}$, the phase of the cutter drive motor 12 is adjusted so that the cut is made precisely in the center of the channel or at another desirable location.

It can be seen from this description that not only is the correction continuous and active in the method described by Durr, but the cutter motor 12 rather than the drive motor 6 is adjusted. Cutter motor 12 is in no way an adjustable drive, its sole function being to cut.

The Examiner's statement that the adjustable drive is motor 12 and that correcting the adjustable drive comprises changing the distance the motor advances to calibration print for cutting the calibration print ignores the fact that the cutter motor 12 and cutter 11 do not advance the calibration print at all, rollers 3 and 4 do this. Accordingly, Durr, et al. do not anticipate the current invention or for that matter, even relate very much to it.

Claim 8, which is somewhat broader than Claim 1, is similarly not anticipated by Durr. In Claim 8, the steps of setting an adjustable component of a cutter associated with an image printer to a first setting, printing a calibration print with the image printer and scanning the calibration print and measuring a feature of the calibration print that is affected by the setting of the adjustable component are not carried out by Durr. If motor 12 and cutter 11 are considered to be the adjustable component, it is clear that no where in Durr is any feature of the print that is affected by the setting of the component scanned. Durr has two sensors, 9 and 14, but both are positioned ahead of the cutter 11 and therefore, they cannot possibly scan a feature of the print that is affected by the setting of the cutter (the adjustable component) since the cutter acts after the second sensor 14. Moreover, the differences mentioned in connection with Claim 1 also apply. There is no mention of printing a calibration print and therefore, a calibration print is not scanned as required by 8(c) and no component is adjusted in response to measuring a feature of the calibration print that is affected by the setting of the adjustable component.

Claims 3 - 5, 10, 16, and 21 are rejected as unpatentable over Durr in view of Staamann, US 3,808, 971. Staamann provides none of that which is missing from Durr. The Examiner relies on Staamann primarily for the teaching of a stepper motor 34. Applicant acknowledges the existence of stepper motors generally, but none of the claims rely solely on the presence of a stepper motor for patentability. Staamann is not directed to any of the other limitations of independent Claims 1 and 8.

Each of the rejections having been addressed, reconsideration and favorable action on the application are requested.

Dated: June 16, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen B. Salai, Esq.
Registration No. 26,990

Harter Secrest & Emery LLP
1600 Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, New York 14604-2711
Tel: (585) 232-6500
Fax: (585) 232-2152

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop NON-FEE AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on June 16, 2003.

Angela J. Beach